



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

AMERICAN JOURNAL OF PHILOLOGY

VOL. XXV, 4.

WHOLE NO. 100.

I.—THE INDO-IRANIAN NASAL VERBS.

I.—INTRODUCTION.

THE ORIGIN OF THE NASAL-FLEXION TYPE.¹

For a number of years past linguistic science has been content to deal with some chapters in morphology in a purely algebraic way. This is particularly true of the nasal flexion of the verb. The *n* which characterizes this flexional type has been treated like the algebraic *x*; *abx*, *axb*, *xab* have been handled as equal algebraic quantities, as a reference to Hirt, *der Indog. Ablaut*, § 693, will show, where the analysis of Skr. *yunājmi* 'I yoke' yields a base *ÿU-EK-* with "inserted" *n*.² So much must be admitted at the start, that the freedom with which the nasal classes interchange argues a cognate origin for them all.³ Thus Gr. *ζεύγνμι* corresponds to Skr. *yunājmi*; many Sanskrit verbs have present systems in *-ñ-* as well as in *-nó-*; and there is similar variation between the present stems of the type *ṛnádñh-* and *ṛdhñó-*.

In the following paper I shall seek to demonstrate for the *n* of the nasal flexional type an arithmetical value. I propose to make a semantic study of the Sanskrit [and Avestan] verbs of nasal flexion listed by Whitney in his *Roots, Verb-Forms*, etc.,

¹ Pedersen in I. F. 2, 318 sq., has given a résumé of previous theories on the origin of this type.

² Brugmann, *Kurze Gram.* § 665, Anm., rejects the notion of an 'infix' in the following words: *entweder war ne ein Satzelement (vielleicht eine Partikel oder ein präpositionales Adverb oder auch eine Art Hilfsverbum) etc. . . .* Cf. also O. Keller in KZ. 39. 162.

³ Cf. Keller, l. c., §§ 34 sq., and especially § 35.

of the Sanskrit Language, adding sundry other roots from the *Dhātupāṭha* as taken up by Uhlenbeck in his Etym. Woert. d. altindischen Sprache.¹

The nasal-flexional type had its rise, I surmise, in contamination (syncretism) of roots of similar (or contrasting) meanings. The evidence of the daily speech about us proves that such contamination is actively in progress before our eyes. When I hear a person of high cultivation and intelligence say *smur* I recognize that we have a blend of *smear* and *blur*. In this schooled age such a word has a small chance to survive. The conditions were much more favorable to survival of such words in a preliterate stage.² Still, examples are not lacking, particularly of tautological formations, such as German Eidschwur, Spieszruten, Bittflehen, Schalksknecht, etc. (see Polle, Wie denkt das Volk über die Sprache, p. 110). Earlier examples are found in Gothic *mari-saiws* 'ocean-sea' (cf. Johannson, Nominal-sammansättning i Gotiskan, Nordiska Studier, p. 457) and in O. E. *lemp-healt/læmpi-halt* 'lame-halt', *wæl-sliht* 'killing-slaughter.' Similar are Eng. *furthermore*, Ital. *ambedue* 'both-two'. In an humbler sphere, *recolmember/recommember* (= recollect + remember), *preparrangements* (= preparations + arrangements), *padrawers* (= pajamas + drawers), *persciver* (= perceive + discover, in the incorrect form *disciver*).

In view of such facts I have undertaken the analysis of the nasal verbs in Sanskrit [Indo-Iranian] in terms of the following theses:

a) In *badhnāti* 'he binds' we have a blend of *badh-* 'to bind' + *-nāti* 'he binds' (*nāti* : Lat. *net* 'spins').

b) In *sinóti* (alongside of *sināti*) 'he binds' we have a blend of *si-* 'to bind' (cf. *syāti* 'he binds') + *-noti* 'he binds' (cf. O. Bulg. *snu-ti* 'ordiri, anzetteln').

c) In *trṇéqhi* 'he crushes' we have a blend of a proethnic base TER- 'to pierce, bore' (cf. Lat. *terit*) + proethnic NEĜH- 'to pierce', attested by O. Bulg. *nizq* 'infigo'.

¹O. Keller's essay, die nasalpräsentia der arischen Sprachen, KZ. 39, 137 sq., appeared when this article was nearly finished. I have drawn on his lists for Iranian bases not represented in Sanskrit.

²Convenient collections of such blended words are to be found in Meringer and Mayer's Versprechen und Verlesen, much of which is taken up by Oertel in his Lectures on the Study of Language, pp. 161 fg.

Before presenting the material, certain preliminary remarks will be in order to explain the phonetic and other principles by which I shall proceed.

d.

There is considerable etymological material—e. g., *στῖφος* 'crowd, mass': *στῖφει* 'crowds, presses' (no. 110)—which seems to show alternation of *i* and *u* in the proethnic period (see Noreen, *Urgerm.* Lautlehre § 22). This material might be accounted for by positing a proethnic *ü*-vowel (so Wharton in his *Etyma Latina*) which yielded now *i* and now *u*, and this variation must needs be ascribed to the proethnic period, as there seems no other way to account for the indiscriminate appearance, now of *i* and now of *u*, in the separate languages. I propose here another solution of the difficulty. There is a large number of words that exhibit long diphthongs, e. g. *ēy* and *ōw*, which mutate, the former, with *ē*, and the latter, with *ō*. This mutation occurs in certain phonetic groups or contexts which have not been isolated and determined, but theoretically we suppose a loss of *y* and *w* conditioned on a special phonetic environment. We no less control the phenomena if we assume that in a certain phonetic context *ē* and *ō* developed parasitic glides *y* and *w*, as our English long vowels do¹: let us say that *ēs* yielded *ēys*, and *ōm* yielded *ōwm*. Supposing the *ē/ō* mutation to have been established prior to the development of *ē*<*y*> from *ē*, *ō*<*w*> from *ō*, we may posit an *ēy/ōw* mutation with subsequent reductions to *əy/əw*, *ī/ū*. We may assume, with contaminated mutations, the series *ē/ō*: *ēy/ōw*: *ōy/ēw*: *ēiw/ōiw*: *ēuy/ōuy*, not all of which must needs have developed to any one root.

e.

Up to this point we have dealt only with the long diphthongs. We shall have to reject a number of cogent etymologies if we deny the mutation of *ē(y)* with *ē* (see Reichelt in *K. Z.* 39, 14 sq.). It is generally denied that *ēy* is ever a reduced stage of *ēy*, and where this phenomenon occurs it is rather held that *ēy* is a long grade in a short diphthong series. It is, at all events, a perfectly tenable theory, that if an original base *GEYE-* had a long grade *Gēy-*², an analogical *BEYE-* might come into

¹ Cf. *Thess.* and *Boeot.* *ei* (i. e. close *ē*)=*η*, in *δει*=*δη*.

² Streitberg's theory that the monosyllabic type *Gēy-* is a dimoric substitute for *Gēy(ē)-* does not convince me. I look upon thematic flexion with *e/o* as a new and "regular" type that replaced an old "irregular" non-thematic

being beside an original long base $\text{B}\bar{\text{E}}\text{V-}$, and I shall condense my notation by writing $\bar{\text{E}}(\text{V})$.

f.

To no longer swim in schematic restorations, I present the following illustrations of the mutations attested for the base $\text{S}\text{N}\bar{\text{E-}}$ 'to spin'.

Vowel bases.

Base $\text{S}\text{N}\bar{\text{E-}}/\text{S}\text{N}\bar{\text{O-}}$.

Goth. *nēpla* 'needle', *νητός* 'spun'; *νόμενος*, *νῶντα*, *νῶσαι* (forms of *νέω* 'I spin'), O. Ir. *snáthat* 'needle'.

Base $\text{S}\text{N}\bar{\text{E-}}$.

Gr. *νετή(?)* 'pin' (if π 180 is to be read $\delta\epsilon$ *νετήσι* instead of δ' *ἐνετήσι*)¹.

Diphthongal Bases.

Base $\text{S}\text{N}\bar{\text{E}}\text{V-}/\text{S}\text{N}\bar{\text{O}}\text{W-}$ [or $\text{S}\text{N}\bar{\text{O}}\text{Y-}/\text{S}\text{N}\bar{\text{E}}\text{W-}$].

O. H. G. *nājan* 'to sew', Skr. *snāyati* 'wraps, clothes', *snāyu* 'band, sinew';—Skr. *snāvan-* 'snāyu', Avest. *snāvarə*, Gr. *νεῦρον*, O. H. G. *nāwan* 'to sew'.

Base $\text{S}\text{N}\bar{\text{E}}\text{Y-}$.

Gr. *νέει* 'spins', Lat. *net* (from *NEYETI* or = $\text{N}\bar{\text{E-}}\text{T?}$).

Base $\text{S}\text{N}\text{I-}$.

O. Bulg. *nitŭ* 'filum'.

Base $\text{S}\text{N}\bar{\text{E}}\text{W-}$ [or $\text{S}\text{N}\text{O}\text{W-}$].

O. Bulg. *snovq* 'ordior', (?) *nevodŭ* 'net', Lat. *nuit* glossed by 'operuit, texit'.

Base $\text{S}\text{N}\text{U-}$.

O. Bulg. *snuti* 'ordiri', Lat. *nu-mella* 'genus vinculi'.

flexional type, and I imagine that the rhythmic change from what I may call monosyllabism to dissyllabism in some way produced the shortening of the "root-syllable", not without leaving traces, in the so-called long-grades, of the original state of things.

¹ *ἐνετή* is usually explained as from *ἐνίημι*. The question arises whether *ἐνετή* does not belong to the base $\text{N}\bar{\text{E}}$ in a dissyllabic form $\text{E}\text{N}\bar{\text{E}}$. If so, an adjustment becomes necessary between the bases $\text{S}\text{N}\bar{\text{E-}}$ and $\text{E}\text{N}\bar{\text{E}}$. If $\text{E}\text{N}\bar{\text{E}}$ is older than $\text{S}\text{N}\bar{\text{E-}}$, then $\text{N}\bar{\text{E}}$ is older than $\text{S}\text{N}\bar{\text{E-}}$. This allows of our supposing that $\text{S}\text{N}\bar{\text{E-}}$ is a blend of $\text{N}\bar{\text{E}}$ 'to bind' + $\text{s}\bar{\text{E}}(\text{V})/\text{s}\bar{\text{O}}(\text{W})$ 'to bind' (cf. Skr. *syditi*/Lat. *sui*), cf. *infra*, B, a., fn., and 15, 1, fn. But if $\text{S}\text{N}\bar{\text{E}}$ is older than $\text{N}\bar{\text{E}}$ we may either posit dissyllabic bases $\text{E}\text{S}\text{N}\bar{\text{E-}}$ and $\text{E}\text{N}\bar{\text{E}}$ or explain $\text{E}\text{N}\bar{\text{E}}$ as subsequent to $\text{N}\bar{\text{E-}}$. Further on this point below.

Triphthongal Bases.

Base s)NƏIW-.

Skr. *n̥wis* 'umgebundenes Tuch' (cf. Skr. *snāyu-*).

g.

In the words hereinafter studied frequent variation of *r* and *l* is exhibited as in DER-/DEL- 'to split'. My argument nowhere concerns itself with identifying these -R and -L bases, but I do not doubt that such bases should be identified, the *r/l* variation being ascribed either to proethnic dissimilation in reduplicated formations, or to a proethnic flux between *r*-dialects and *l*-dialects.

h.

In Greek and Latin *ā* sometimes appears in forms belonging to an *ē/ō* root. I do not question the truth of the prevailing explanation of such *ā*'s as due to analogical influence from the *ǝ*-derived *ā*'s which form a common member of the *ā*-series as well as of the *ē/ō*-series. Such *ā*'s throughout this paper will be designated as *ǝ*-derived *ā*'s (or briefly as from *ǝ*); cf. no. 168.

i.

Every study of words in groups must confront the question of "root-determinatives".¹ Every theory on this subject is necessarily glottogenic. For myself, I think that there is more than one source of these "determinatives". I have already expressed the conviction that the *y* and *w* of the *ēy/ōw* type are parasitic glides whose nature we might typify by the writing *ē<y>*, *o<w>*. Other "determinatives" seem to me to have originated in onomatopoetic groups, as in the English words *knack* and *knap*, *flack* and *flap*, e. g. The prevailing source I take to have been the rhyming motif. Thus Latin *ap̄io*, *cap̄io*, *rap̄io*,² all of which indicate more or less intensive forms of 'taking', rhyme because they correspond in meaning or conversely. So the large correspondence in meaning to be noted for the nasal verbs is correlate with their rhyming flexion.

¹ Repeated efforts have not enabled me to procure a copy of Persson's essay on this subject.

² Why not write *c-ap̄io*, *r-ap̄io* with initial "determinatives"?

j. (see also w., Ch. III).

In regard to the root-determinatives, it frequently happens (1) that *-t-*, e. g., is found in some languages, *d* in others; (2) that the alternation *-d/-dh* is attested (particularly when nasals form the phonetic context); as well as (3) the alternation *-t/-dh*.¹ Inasmuch as a "root" can hardly be regarded as anything but the language-user's abstraction of what, to his mind, carries the essential unmodified concept (inner meaning) of a word, we can imagine a root *ac-* abstracted from *actus*, or *ag-* from *agmen*, *ut-* from Skr. *ūt-sas* 'wave' but *ud-* from *udakām* 'water'. A telling instance of the power of a single word to form a 'root' is the French root (or base) *roul-* 'to roll' which has come from Lat. *rotula-* 'wheel'. Besides the possible rôle of the nasal² in variations of the *-d/-dh* type, we see in Skr. *duhitār-* alongside of Gāthīc *dugēdar-* (from DHUGDHER) how the 'root' DHUG-, as found in Gr. *θυγάτηρ*, was abstracted. It is not clear that *-t/-dh* can be explained in a similar way, though one might suppose that the common middle term *d* of the two alternations *-t/-d*, *-dh/-d* would serve as a bridge between *t* and *dh*, and the triple variation *-t/-d/-dh* does, in fact, sporadically occur (cf. Prellwitz, Woert. s. vv. *πήγνυμι ῥήγνυμι*). Rhyme must have played a part here. If, e. g., we suppose a proethnic base SKĀP-, 'to prop' attested by Doric *σκάπος* 'staff', Lat. *scāpus* 'stalk', *σκήπτει* 'props', and a proethnic base STEBH- 'to prop' (see Skr. *stabhnāti* and its cognates in Uhlenbeck, ai. Woert. s. v.) we could explain the Sanskrit base *skabh-* as a blend of SKĀP- and *stabh-*.

k.

In the mass of semantic material to be dealt with in this study I have aimed at the greatest possible concreteness and definiteness, holding the views expressed by Meringer in the introduction to his essay, *Wörter und Sachen* (I. F. 16, 101 sq.). But it is precisely here that great difficulties confront us, including all manner of subjectivity in individuals. Thus when Meringer discusses a semantic group which he defines by 'ackert' (I. c. 180), this definition seems to me vague and general, concrete enough

¹ In Sanskrit this frequently appears as *-th/-dh/-kh/-gh* etc., and I suspect that here the surd aspirates, *th* and *kh*, represent proethnic T, K, assimilated to the sonant aspirates, *dh*, *gh*.

² See Brugmann, Gr. I³ § 704 anm.

but very indefinite.¹ Who would be disposed to question the semantic primitiveness, e. g., of the Eng.-French "root" *roll-/roul-*? Who would see in it a denominative from Lat. *rotula* 'wheel'? One may (1) roll (=turn) a hoop, (2) roll (=wrap) a cigarette, (3) roll a drum, and one may (4) turn (cf. Germ. *werden*: Lat. *vertere*) pale or turn philosopher. If it is easy to see the relation of (1) and (2), which consists in a reasonably plain metaphor addressed to the eye; we must imagine, I take it, the noise made by some heavy rolling body before we understand the rolling (3) of thunder or of a drum, wherein the metaphor is addressed to the ear. How to account for the metaphor in (4) I confess I do not altogether see, but it makes me suspect that the "root" of 'to become', Skr. *bhāvati*, may have started life with a very different sense from the vague and abstract notion of 'coming into existence'. I think rather that the primitive sense of the root BHŌW-² must have been something like 'grows' (cf. Gr. *φύω*),—which in its turn is too vague to satisfy one as a final solution (see no. 41).

1.

The colloquial idioms and slang of our own day also furnish valuable instruction to the etymologist. We might conclude, without the help of historical inquiry, that the phrase 'to strike a bargain' testified to some 'striking' that formed a part of the transfer of ownership, and that 'bargain' is quasi figura etymologica in its relation to 'strike.' Similar exhibitions of figura etymologica, broadly considered, are to be found in the locution 'to cast a sum' (cf. Fr. *jeter les jetons*, whence *jeter une somme*), 'to crack a joke', 'a shaft of wit' (cf. Lat. *jocus* 'shaft of wit': *jacere* 'to throw'). Of course we must use caution here, but the metaphors of slang and of colloquial language in general seem to me likely to reveal very clearly the mental processes of the unlettered neolithic man. If the Norseman said *spānnýr* 'span-new' = "new as a chip just split off", I suspect the neolithic man may have got his word *NEWOS 'new' from a base NEW- meaning 'to split', and that the usage was a flint-chipper's metaphor. Certainly the words *spick* = "spike-new" and the compounds *fire-new*, *brand-new* attest the technical nature

¹ To be sure, he makes his definition more precise = "Das anbohren des bodens mittelst eines spitzen holzes", but it is rather 'anbohrt' than 'ackert' that I see in his subsequent illustrations.

² I take the liberty of citing any grade form of a base as the "root".

of the concept 'new.' Indeed, I can imagine the development of the concept 'new' only in connection with manufacture (i. e. new-made, cf. *καινο-τομεῖ* 'novat') or with birth (i. e. new-born).

m.

To attain concreteness in definition a knowledge of the daily life of the users of the words studied is of enormous importance. Words unquestionably develop as things develop. There are several sources of words, to be sure, (1) the onomatopoeic words which subdivide into at least two classes (a) acoustic imitations, (b) symbolic imitations ("Lautbilder", so Wundt, *die Sprache* I, pp. 316 sq. 322); (2) demonstrative or gesture words, to which class I conceive *ΕΣΤΙ* 'is' (= 'there!') to belong, cf. Ital. *eccomi, eccolo* 'there it is';¹ (3) sound reflexes which accompanied, perhaps as song, the man and woman at work and at play. It is to this latter class that the words to be studied here seem to me to belong. At any rate I have sought to account for most of them as developed by the neolithic man and woman at work with the tools and processes at their command. These tools we may at least partially control by the results of archaeological investigations; and what must be substantially similar processes still obtain in the savage and lower-class life of comparatively recent or present times. By way of illustration, taking the group of words mentioned above in f., one may ask if the neolithic woman twisted, plaited, then wove and sewed, as one might infer from the words cited by Schrader, *Reallexikon*, s.vv. *nähen u. weben*. It seems to me rather that she, or her ancestors, first used sinews for thread and fastened skins or leather together by using an awl and a sinew in modes identical with those used but a little while ago by the wild Indian of the Western plains, who was housed and clothed in buffalo-skins thus adapted to his use; and not essentially different from the mode used to-day by the shoemaker. Such sewing was literal 'stitching' (: *sticks*, cf. Germ. *sticken*: *stechen*), and the 'needle' used was a 'piercer, pricker' not a 'sewing instrument'. Spite of the priority in literary emergence of Lat. *nēre* 'to spin' over O. H. G. *nājan* 'to sew', we do not know that the root *SNĒ-* meant 'to spin' before it meant 'to sew'. Why is not 'spin' a denominative meaning 'to thread' (cf. Fr. *filer* 'to spin' from **filare*: *filum*

¹ In negro English "here me, dar he".

'thread')? The 'sinew-thread' was got by 'cutting' and used with a 'pricker'; 'sewing' was 'pricking' and later on 'spinning' was 'threading' perhaps. We do not know whether the "root" SNĒ- was an onomatopoetic description of 'cutting', or formed a part of the work-song of the 'cutter' or 'stitcher', nor is it necessary to know. The considerations advanced allow the conclusion that SNĒ- did not necessarily mean 'to sew', but may have meant 'to stitch', and earlier 'to pierce, cut'.

n.

A large part of our current phonetic dogma is derived from morphological reconstructions incapable of proof. Thus Lat. *novacula* 'a cutting tool' is deduced by Schrader (l. c. s. v. messer) from **nogwacula*: O. Bulg. *noži* (from **nogyi*) 'knife' though it seems more natural to suppose that *noži* is from **nozyi* and belongs with *nizq*, -*noziti* 'to pierce, cut' (from NEĜH-). Others derive *novacula* from **csnovacula*: Skr. *kṣṇāūti* 'cuts'. I shall claim presently that *novacula* belongs to a base S)NĒ(Y)-/s)NŌ(W)- 'to cut', a base already written as NEW- in l. above.¹ To illustrate the danger attendant on morphological restorations, and it is a danger I shall hardly dare hope to escape in the restorations that follow, let us project English *boat* and *boatswain* on a proethnic period as *BŌT and *BŌSN: the etymologist would doubtless correctly correlate the words and derive the second from BO(T)SN(O)-, but he would probably balk at identifying the "suffix" *SN(O)- with *SWĒN (= Eng. *swain*) 'puer'. Still, it must be admitted that his analysis would be in the main correct. On the other hand, if Eng. *sorrow* and *sorry* were proethnic bases, who could bring himself to separate them—as we must do, in view of Germ. *Sorge*, *ver-sehren*? But the language-user of to-day would undoubtedly abstract from *sorrow* and *sorry* a "root" *SORR-; and such a popular etymology, if proethnic, is tantamount, with us, to a genuine cognation.

o.

In the terms of the theses a. b., announced above, the Sanskrit flexion in -*nāti* -*nōti*, taken as typical of the proethnic flexion,

¹ Is not Skr. *kṣṇāūti* an Indic blend of the base KES- (Skr. *śasati*) 'to cut' + NŌWTI 'cuts'? Or *kṣṇāūti* may be for **snāūti* 'cuts', modified by the *kṣ-* of *kṣurás* 'razor'.

presents in *-nā-* and *-nó-* an independent verb "root" (or "roots") blended, primarily, with other roots of similar (or contrasting) meaning, but secondarily capable of wider extension when the "roots" represented by *nā* and *nó* had sunk to the value of "suffixes" ("formatives"). It becomes necessary, therefore, to exhibit all the range of meaning that we can discover for the "root" (or "roots") that I shall write as *S)NĒ(Y)-/ S)NŌ(W)-*, including also *SNĀ(W)-*.

One may hardly deny that the primitive folk may have had an *n*-number of "roots" *S)NĒY-*, or putting it otherwise, an *n*-number of meanings attached to the sound-group *SNĒY-*. It will be the object of the following classification so to arrange the meanings as to diminish the number of *SNĒY*-s as much as possible, reserving for the body of the essay still further reductions in the semantic units that must finally be admitted.

A word here, also, on the fact that the assumed blending base *S)NĒ(Y)-*, in its rôle of present-forming suffix, appears—at least in all previous reconstructions—only as *NĒY-* [*NĀ(Y)-*], never as *SNĒ(Y)-*. In what follows some traces of the *S-* of *SNĒ(Y)-*, but never quite beyond doubt, will be pointed out. An absolutely certain instance would be offered by Umbrian *persnīmu* 'pre-camino', if it were possible successfully to rebut Brugmann's doctrine (IF. 16, 510) that *persnīmu* is a denominative to a noun stem **persni-*. This, however, we may claim, viz.: that **persni-* is to be derived rather from *PERĶ-SNI-* than from **perk-sk-ni-*; for *PERĶ-SNI-* compared with Skr. *praçnás* 'question' presents the variation otherwise of record for *-NO-* and *-SNO-* suffixes (cf. Brugmann, Grundriss II, §§ 66, 94), and we may suppose these suffixes to be ultimately one with the present-forming suffix *NĒ(Y)-/ SNĒ(Y)-*. To put it quite concretely: the Latin stem *scamno-* 'bench' belongs with the present stem of Skr. *skabhñā-ti* 'props', and Lith. *pru-snà* 'Maul' (= mouth, quasi snout) with Skr. *pru-ṣṇā-ti* 'sprinkles', cf. *πλύνει* with *L* (see g. and no. 24).¹

¹ It is tempting to explain the Greek verbs in *-έννυμι*, *-άννυμι* as from **-ε-σνυμι*, **-α-σνυμι*, but the number of their perfects and aorists in *-σμαι*, *-σθην* makes the division **-εσ-νυμι* more probable (see Archiv, 13, 437). On the other hand, the *σ* of *-σμαι*, *-σθην* is not certainly original [see Fick in BB, 29, 11, treating *κορέννυμι*]. Phonetically, whether we divide **-ε-σνυμι* or **-εσ-νυμι*, the resultant *-έννυμι* is abnormal. This abnormality I would explain as due to the analogy of the likewise abnormal (see Brugmann's Gr. Gram.³ § 108. C.) *έννυμι* 'vestio'; see also r. fn.

p.

A. To sew—plait, spin, wrap, etc.

a) *The simple root.*

S)NĒ(Y)-/ SNĀ(Y)-/ SNI-; S)NŌ(Y), etc.

νήσαι, [(?) νετή 'needle', ἐ-νεός 'deaf and dumb' (if = 'tongue-tied', cf. the tale of Battus in Justin, 13. 7. 1), cf. f. fn.], *nē-re*, [(?) Lat. *onus* (if = 'pack'), with vocalism as in f. fn.]; Skr. *snāyati* 'wraps, clothes', O. H. G. *nājan*, Celtic *snēyō*¹, Skr. *snāyu* 'sinew-thread'; *nemís* 'tire', *νάεppa* δέσποινα (if = 'spinster'); Lith. *nitis*, O. B. *nitū* 'thread'.

S)NŌ(W)-/ S)NĒ(W)-, S)NU-.

Skr. *snāvan*, νεῦρον 'sinew-thread', ναῦν ἔριον (= 'wool'); Lat. *nāvis* (if = πλοῖον ῥαπτόν, *cymba sutilis*)²; (?) O. B. *nevodū* 'net', *nevēsta* 'nova nupta'; *nuit*, glossed by 'operuit, textit',³ *numella* 'vinculi genus', O. Bulg. *snu-ti* 'ordiri', Gortyn. *νύ-ναι* 'potest' (see no. 93, fn.); Skr. *nīv-is* (from SNĀIW-) 'sash, girdle'.

β) *The root with guttural "determinatives".*

S)NĒ(Y)-K- and its mutations.

νεῖκ-ος (if = 'wrangle'); —νέξας τὰ στρώματα, *nec-tit* 'binds', *Necessitas* (cf. Horace, C. 1. 35, 17-20) 'the Binder' (?), *necessitudo* 'connection', *naxa* 'wheel'.

S)NĒ(Y)-G-, etc.

νηγάτεος 'new-spun', Lat. *noegeum* 'amiculi genus', Slavic *negvy* 'fetters', (?) Skr. *nig-aḍas* 'fetter'.

SNĒ(Y)-GH-, etc.

Skr. *nāh-yati* 'binds', Lat. *nectit* (if from NEGHTETI⁵), Skr. *nāhus-* 'neighbour' (?), cf. Lat. *necessarius*.

γ) *The root with dental "determinatives".*

S)NĒ(Y)-T-, etc.

Goth. *neiþ*, O. Ir. *nith* 'Noth' (if = 'Necessitas'), *ναίτεπα* οἰκοδέσποινα (if = 'spinster'), O. Bulg. *ništa* (from **nitya*) 'filum'; Skr. *nityas* 'proprius' (if = 'necessarius').

S)NĒ(W)-T-, etc.

¹ Celtic bases are taken from Stokes's volume (= II) in Fick's *Woerterbuch*.

² With *ā*; cf. Lat. *nā-re*: νεύ-σεται 'nabit', where *ā* appears in an e/o series (see h., above, and B., a, below).

³ Cf. *conīvet* 'closes' (the eyes), from a base SNEIW-; *conivoli* 'conjuncti'; the pf. *conixi* (cf. *vivo: vixi*) attests the base SNĒY-G-, see β, below.

⁴ Slavic words are cited generally from Miklosich, *Woert*.

⁵ Even if proethnic *k* is proved by *Necessitas*, etc. (see above), yet the guttural of *nectit* goes to vindicate the guttural of *nāhyati* (rather than the dental of its ptc. *naddhds*).

Goth. *naups* 'Necessitas'.

SNĒ(Y)-D- and its mutations.

νήδυμος (ἵπνος) 'fast' (sleep), νήδυσ (if = *netz*haut), Celtic *snad-* 'to bind', Goth. *nati* 'net', Lat. *nassa* 'weel' (if from NADTA);—(?) Skr. *nid-rā* 'sleep' (cf. Shakespeare's "sleep that *knits* up the ravelled sleeve of care").

SNŌ(W)-D- and its mutations.

O. Bulg. *nuditi* 'obligare'.

SNĒ(Y)-DH-, / SNŌ(W)DH- and their mutations.

νήθ-ει 'spins', Lat. *nōdus* 'knot' (if not from GNŌ(W)-D(H)OS, and related to Eng. *knot*, Germ. *knoten*), νόθος 'bastard' (= "tie", see Class. Rev. 13, 400)¹, Skr. *naddhās* 'bound', Celtic *ned-* 'to bind', O. H. G. *nestilo* 'bandschleife'. With *u*-color, νυθός 'dumb (if = "tongue-tied")²; dark' (if = "covered"); cf. Lat. *infula* 'fillet', from NDH-LĀ- (see Class. Rev. l. c.).

δ) The root with labial "determinatives".

S)NĒ(Y)-P-, / S)NŌ(W)-P- and their mutations.

νήπιος, νηπίτιος 'infans' (if = 'swaddled'), Skr. *nepathyam* 'vestimentum, dressing room', O. Bulg. *snapŭ* 'sheaf' (if = 'Bündel'), Lat. *nepot-* 'relation, tendril of a plant', Lat. (archaic and liturgical) *napurae* 'twisted ropes of straw';—Skr. *nūpūram* 'fuss-ring'.

S)NĒ(Y)-BH-/ S)NŌ(W)BH-.

νεφέλαι 'bird-net',³ νέφος 'cloud'⁴ (if = 'veil'), *nebula* 'veil' (Petronius), Skr. *nābhyam* 'navel' (if = 'umbilical cord');—Lat. *nūbit* 'veils for', *nūbes* 'cloud' (if = 'veil'), νύμφη 'nova nupta', O. B. *snuḃiti* 'appetere, amare' (if = 'novam nuptam petere').

ε) The root with an *s*. "determinative".

S)NĒ(Y)-S-, etc.

Skr. *nāsate* 'joins', Goth. *ga-nasjan* 'to cure' [if = 'obligare (vulnus)'], Celt. *nes-* 'sich gesellen, wohnen'⁵; O. Bulg. *nes-tra* 'niece' (if = 'connection'), Skr. *niškās*, 'necklace', *ni-mśate* 'sie küssen';—with *u*, Skr. *snuṣā* 'nurus'.

ζ) The root with a nasal or liquid "determinative".

S)NĒ(Y)-R- and its mutations.

¹ Cf. Skr. *bāndhulas* 'bastard': *bāndhus* 'relation'.

² Cf. *linguae obligatio*, Justin, 13. 7. 1, cited above, A. a.

³ Cf. *ναφρόν* λινοῦν ῥάμ(μ)α.

⁴ Eng. *cloud* meant 'mass, clod' (i. e. 'gebundenes' or 'geschnittenenes').

⁵ Cf. *νάσ-θη* 'dwelt'.

Skr. *nārī* 'woman' (if = 'spinster'), Goth. *snōrjō* 'flechtwerk', νηρία¹ μαράθον θάμνος, Slavic *neretŭ* 'net', Lat. *nervus*¹ 'sinew-thread, fetter', *norma* (if originally = plumb-line, cf. Colum. 3. 13. 12 basis ad perpendicularum normata), O. Bulg. *nравŭ* (from **norvŭ*) 'mos'.

S)NĒ(Y)L-/S)NŌ(W)L-.

νηλος² ἔριον, νηλ-ής (Homer) 'binding' (?),² νωλεμές quasi 'seriatim'.

B. *caedere scindere* and related concepts.

a) *The simple root.*

S)NĒ(Y)- and its mutations.

νώματα³ ἐπὶ τῶν ὑποσυγίων τὰ γνωρίσματα (= 'notae', see γ., below) νει-ρή⁴ (? or νειρ-ή) κοιλία ἐσχάτη (if = δέρτρον), Skr. *nī-pās* (? or *nīp-as*) 'low-lying' (if = 'cavatus'), νε-τή (? ἐνετή or νετ-ή, see f.) 'pricker, pin'.

S)NŌ(W)-/S)NĒ(W)-, etc.

(?) Lat. *nausciŕ* 'aperit' (if = se scindit), *novus* 'new' (cf. l. above), *novem* 'nine'³, *novacula* 'knife' (see n. above), *novale* 'fallow land, brach-land', *noverca* (if = quae temnit, caedit), Lith. *noviti, nãviti* 'quälen', O. Bulg. *навѣ* 'mortuus' (if = 'caesus'), Celt. *neveno, novenya* 'famine' (cf. *pangs* of hunger);—Lat. glosses *navia* 'lignum cavatum', *navat* 'frangat', *navo* 'rescendo' (? leg. rescindo);—Skr. *nu-* (lexicographical only) 'weapon', *snú-* 'chine' (*chine*: O. H. G. *skina* 'prickle', cf. Lat. *spina* 'thorn, backbone'), cf. O. Pruss. *nowis* 'nates'.⁴

S)NEI(W)- and its mutations.

νειός 'fallow-land, brach-land', νείαιρα 'abdomen' (if = δέρτρον), Goth. *neiwan* 'to hate, be angry at'; — O. Bulg. *niva* 'ager', Skr. *nī-* 'down' (= 'humi' cf. also Fr. *à bas*, Ital. *abbasso*), cf. Lat. *dē* 'down' from DĒY- 'to cut' (further discussed below).

S)NĀ(W)-.

nāvis 'boat' (if = 'dugout', see below), Low Germ. *snau* 'navis rostrata' [cf., with a different but cognate (?) base O. H. G. *snacga*], Eng. *snow*.

¹ It is conceivable that *nervus* came from NEREWOS, with syllable transposition for NĒWEROS, cf. Avest. *snāvarə*, as I have had a student say *viligance* for 'vigilance' (cf. *diligence*?).

² In conjunction with *δεσμός* 'fetter', ὕπνος 'sleep' (cf. νήδυμος ὕπνος), ἡμαρ 'dies necessitatis';—cf. νηλεγές ἀνοικτον.

³ If 'nine' is the 'new' number of the third tetrad; ἐννέα would then come from E-SNEWĀ (cf. f. fn.), with dialectic ἐνν- for εἰν-/ἦν-.

⁴ *νῶτα* 'back' Lat. *nātes* 'rump' will be cited further on; the Skr. stem *śā-nu-* may attest the contamination suggested above in f. fn.

β) *The root with a guttural "determinative".*

S)NĒ(Y)-K-/ S)NĒ(Y)-Ķ- etc.

νεῖκος 'quarrel'¹ (if = quasi 'pugna', cf. πλήκτης 'striker, brawler'), νίκη 'victory', Skr. *nīkṣati* 'pierces', O. Bulg. *nik-naŭti* 'germinare' (if = "pousser": Lat. *pulsare*);—*necat* 'caedit', *nocet* 'injures';—νάκος 'fleece' (if = 'δέρμα'), Goth. *snaga* 'paenula'.

SNŌ(W)-K-.

Lat. *naucum* 'bit, particle', O. Bulg. *nukati* 'to cheer, incite' (if = 'to stimulate').

S)NĒ(Y)-G-/ S)NŌ(W)-G- and their mutations.

νώγαλα 'tid-bits', O. Pruss. *nognan* 'leather' (i. e. 'δέρμα'), Skr. *nagnās* 'stript' (if = 'skinned', cf. ψιλός 'plucked, stript, naked');—νίγλαρος 'pipe' (if = 'cavatum'), (?) Skr. *nigamās* 'einfügung' (cf. Mod. Pers. *niyām* 'scabbard' i. e. 'scheide');—Lat. *nūgae* 'bits, particles, *punti*', νύγμα 'puncture', νύγει τῷ κέντρῳ πλήττει.

SNĒ(Y)-ĜH-/ S)NŌ(W)-GH- and their mutations.

νώχμα 'ὄνειδος' (cf. νύχμα), Skr. *snīhitis/snēhitis* 'weapon (?)', en-counter' (?);—Celtic **neg-* 'to pierce', *nagnos* 'bescheiden', O. Bulg. *nogūti*, O. H. G. *nagal* 'nail, claw';—Skr. *nih-* (?) 'to blame', O. Bulg. *nizq* 'infigo' (cf. *nozī* in n. above);—νύχμα 'ὄνειδος', 'puncture', νύσσει 'pricks', νύσσα 'meta' (further treated below), ὄνουχ- 'nail', with "prothetic" vowel, like ἐνετή (see f. fn. above).

γ) *The root with dental "determinatives".*

S)NĒ(Y)-T- and its mutations.

νώτον 'chine' (cf. Lat. *nātis*² 'rump', see above A. a.), Lat. *not-a* 'mark, cut', Lith. *noterē* 'nettle';—Goth. *sneīpan* 'caedere', (?) Skr. *nitambas* 'jaw, precipice, bluff';—with *u*-vowel, Goth. *snut-rs* 'wise' (if = 'sharp, smart', cf. T. ζ.).

SNĒ(Y)-D- and its mutations.

Celt. *snādo* 'defendo', νηδύς 'belly' (if = δέτρον), Celt. *snado* 'I cut', M. H. G. *snate* 'vulnus', O. H. G. *nezzila*, 'nettle';—Celtic *nenadi* 'nettle', (?) Skr. *nadās* 'arundo'; Slavic *nadŭ* 'bait, decoy' (if = Gr. δέλεαρ, δόλος, see no. 12 below), Lith. *nodai* 'artes magicae', Russ. *snastŭ* 'tool', O. Bulg. *snadŭ* 'superficie tenus' (if = 'grazing');—Gr. ὄνειδος (with "prothetic" vowel, see f. above), Skr. *nī-nd-ate* (but note pass. *nidyāte*) 'temnit';—with

¹ Cf. νεκήσαι ἄρόσαι (= arare).

² Cf. Horace, Sat. 1. 8. 47, *diffisa* nāte.

u- diphthong, Lat. *nūdus* 'stript' (cf. B. β. on Skr. *nagnās*), unless this is from NOGWEDOS.¹

δ) *The root with labial "determinatives."*

SNĒ(Y)-P- and its mutations.

(?) Skr. *nāpītās* 'barber';—O. Bulg. *snopŭ* 'sheaf' (if = ἀμᾶλλα rather than δράγμα or garbe), Russ. *naparie* 'vorbohrer';—νάπη 'ravine' (= "hollow"), νάπος γυναικὸς αἰδοῖον;—Skr. *nīpās* 'low-lying'.

SNĒ(Y)-BH- and its mutations.

Skr. *nābhis* 'navel, nave' (: O. H. G. *nabagēr* 'naveborer'); *nābhate* 'bursts', νέφος 'cloud' [if = 'quod scinditur' rather than 'quod (aquam) retinet'], νιφάδες 'sores, wounds';—with *u*- vowel, (?) νύμφη 'point of ploughshare'.

ε) *The root with an s- "determinative."*

S)NĒ(Y)-S, etc.

(?) νεσ-τορίς 'cup' (if = σκαφίς);—Skr. *nās-*, Lat. *nāsus/nāres* 'nose' (if = Eng. *thirl* 'hole' in 'nos-tril'), O. Bulg. *noz-dri* 'nasenlöcher', Lat. *nas-turtium* 'a pungent cress';—(?) νόσ-φι 'forsaken, solus' (see no. 15, below);—νέ-νασ-μαι 'pressi', ναστός 'pressus' (if = 'beaten' cf. F. β., ε.);—with *u*- color, (?) O. H. G. *nuosk* 'trough', cf. O. B. *nǔstvy* 'mac-tra'.

ζ) *The root with a liquid or nasal "determinative"*.

S)NĒ(Y)-R-, S)NĒ(Y)-L, etc.

Skr. *nārācās* 'arrow', *nālās* 'arundineus';—*nalās* 'arundo';—Homeric νηλεί χαλκῶ 'caedenti aere', νωλεμέως 'εὐθύ' (if = 'mit einem schlag');—with *u*- vowel, (?) νυρεῖ 'νύσσει, νυρίζει' ξύει.

C. To be wet,—actions and conditions connected with water.

α) *The simple root.*

SNŌ(W)- and its mutations.²

νέει 'swims' (Fut. νεύσεται), νευτήρ* κολυμβητής;—ναύει, νάει 'flows', ναίει 'drips, is full' (cf. F.), Skr. *snāti* 'lavitur', *snāñti* 'drips';—ναῦν* πηγαῖον ὕδωρ, Lacon. νόα 'spring', Skr. *smulās* 'dripping'.

β) SNĒ(Y)-GW- and its mutations.

Skr. *nejāyati*, 'washes', νίξει, Celt. *nigo*.

S)NĒ(Y)-GHW, S)NĒ(Y)-GH-, etc.

νίχει 'swims', Skr. *snēhati* 'is moist', Celt. *snigo* 'I drop'; Skr. *snīhyati* 'is moist, sticky; sticks (to)', *nīhākā*, *nīhārās*

¹ Gr. γυμνός, if not from a different root, attests a *u*- diphthong, and may be explained from NUGWNÓS, whence GW(N)UGWNÓS. Whence comes the *g* in Ital. *ignudo*, doublet of *nudo* 'nudus'?

² A (?) or ə appears in this root very frequently, cf. *nāvis* 'boat'; see h. above.

'mist', *νωχελής* 'sluggish' (if = 'sticky'), O. E. *snegel* 'snail', Swed. *snigel* 'limax', O. Pruss. *snigslo* 'dough';—O. Bulg. *-nyti* 'ignavum esse', *naviti* 'ermüden'.

γ) S)NĒ(Y)-T-.

vor-epós 'wet', (?) Ital. *notare/nuotare* 'to swim'.¹

S)NĒ(Y)-D-, SNĒ(Y)-DH-, etc.

Skr. *nédāti* 'flows, streams';—Celt. *nad-* 'manare', Goth. *natyan* 'to moisten', Skr. *nadí* 'river';—*νωθής*, *νωθρός* 'sluggish' (if = 'sticky');—with *u-* diphthong, Celt. *snoudo* 'dripping'.

γ) *The root with labial "determinatives"*.

S)NĒ(Y)-B-.

O. E. *ge-nip* 'mist, cloud', cf. *νέφος*, *nūbes* in A. δ; Skr. *nīhārās* in B. β.

ζ) *The root with liquid "determinatives"*.

Lith. *nėrti* 'to dive'— but intrans. = 'to thread', cf. Slavic *neretū* 'net' in A. ζ.— O. Bulg. *nyrěti* 'to dive'.

D. Verbs of motion and related concepts.

α) S)NĒ(Y)- / S)NŌ(W)- and their mutations.

Skr. *ndyati* 'leads', (?) *νω-σις* *ρέμβος* (if = 'wanderer'); Skr. *nāvate* 'wendet, kehrt sich', Goth. *sniwan* 'to hasten', O. Norse *snua* 'wenden, kehren, drehen', (?) Lat. *navus* 'celar ac strenuus'.²

γ) S)NŌ(W)-D-.

Skr. *nudāti* 'drives forth'.

ε) S)NE-S-.

νέεται 'heimkehrt',³ *νόστος* 'heimkehr', *νίσεται* (for **νι-νσ-εται*) 'turns back, turns in' (cf. Lat. *devorsorium* 'inn').

ζ) S)NĒ(Y)-R-.

(?) *νειρός* 'vehement', Slav. *ner-* 'ingredi'.

E. To sing, praise, beseech.

α) SNŌW-.

Skr. *nāváś* 'shout', *ndvate* 'cheers, praises, Celt. **nouslon* 'noise';—*ναίειν* *ικερέειν*, (?) *νωσις* *πρωχός* (if = 'pleader').

¹ If the *o/uo* of Italian is descended from *o*, then the *a* of *natat* 'swims' would be either for *ə* or a secondary literary Latin development of *o* (i. e. for *notat*).

² The negative *ignavus* seems to make for **gnavus*, but the shift from **innavus* to *i-ynavus* may have been due to a fancied connection between *ignarus* 'stupid' and **innavus* 'slow, slothful', cf. O. Norse *knār* 'vigorous' (cited by Wharton, Etym. Lat.).

³ This development of meaning may have arisen as in Ital. *tornare* 'heimkehren', denominative to *τόρνος* 'lathe, drill' (: *τείρει* 'pierces, bores').

γ) S)NĒ(Y)-D-.

Skr. *ṛādati* 'roars, cries'.

S)Nā-DH-/S)Nā-TH-.

Skr. *nāḍhamānas* 'precans' (= lacessens? see no. 14, fn.)
nāthate 'seeks help'.

F. To heap up, load, fill; press; pack, carry, bear.

α) S)NĒ(Y)-.

νέει, νήει, νηνέει 'heaps up, loads, fills' (cf. *νένηται* 'πεπλήρωται, νενημένος' συγκείμενος, νητός 'heaped, stored').

β) S)NĒ(Y)-K-.

ἐναξε 'pressed down' (Odyss.), *νακτός* 'pressed, solid', τὰ *νακτά* 'felt', (?) *νέκταρ* 'mustus', O. Bulg. *nesq* 'veho'.

SNĒ(Y)-G-.

νάγμα 'stone wall', (?) Skr. *nāgaram* 'city', (?) *nāgas* 'mons'.

ε) S)NĒ(Y)-S-.

νενασμένος 'πεπλησμένος, ναστός 'close-pressed, solid, firm' (cf.

B. ε.).

ζ) S)NŌ(W)-R.

(?) Slav. *norica* 'tumor pectoris'.

G. To bend, sink, nod; lean, fall.

α) S)NĒ(W)-.

νέυει 'sinks, bends, nods', Lat. *nuit* 'nods'¹ (cf. no. 113, fn.).

β) S)NĒ(Y)-Ē- (Ē or K), S)NĒ(Y)-G-.

nictat 'nods';—O. Bulg. *naglŭ* 'praeceps', Skr. *nāṣyati* 'is lost, disappears' (= falls), O. Bulg. *nicati* 'pronum esse', νέκυσ 'cadaver', νῶκαρ 'caedes'.

ε) S)NŌ(W)-S-.

νέυει (see α), νυστάζει 'nods', νύσταλος 'drowsy'.²

H. To strive, attain, be busy.

β) SNĒ(Y)-Ē-, S)NĒ(Y)-G-.

Skr. *nāṣati* 'reaches, attains', *nāṣati*, Lat. *nactus* (cf. Gr. *ἥνεγκε* 'bore', with the sense of F), (?) *nictat* 'strives' (cf. *nixus* 'having striven'), (?) *negotium* 'business', O. Bulg. *snagna* 'studium', *snagota* 'celeritas'.

γ) S)NĒ(Y)-T-.

Lat. *nītilur* 'strives', *natinatur* 'is busy'.

I. To prop, hold³; wait for (cf. C).

¹ Skeat gives Eng. *nods* an original sense of 'to push, beat, shake'.

² Cf. Eng. *drowsy* from O. E. *dreosan* 'to drip, fall, fail'.

³ This denominative sense comes from propping with a stick, cf. Ital. *puntellare*.

(β) SNĒ(Y)-K-.

νάξει· ἐρείσει, λιθάσει.

(γ) S)NĒ(Y)-T-.

Celt. **net-*, meanings as in I, Goth. *nīpan* 'to prop'.

J. To shine; glisten, be dark.¹

β. S)NĒ(Y)-GH-/S)NŌ(W)-GH.

Lat. *nigro-* 'black', (cf. *negritu* 'aegritudo', Paulus-Festus),

νύχος· νύξ, σκότος.²

γ) S)NĒ(Y)-T-/S)NŌ(W)-DH-.

O. Bulg. *snět* 'rubigo, rust, mildew', Lat. *nitet* 'gleams, glistens';—*νθός* 'niger'.

q.

In Sanskrit the *nā* class verbs have a stem alternation *nā* and *nī*, in Homer *νη* and *να*. It is customary to write proethnic *Nā* and *Nə* for the European languages. But *Nā* is not certain. I can find no indubitable attestation in the *ā*-dialects of the type **δαμνάμι*;³ the *nā* in Lat. *inclināre* may well be secondary (see Brugmann, Gr. II, § 603); the other European languages and Armenian are indecisive, though Germanic forms (infinitives) in *-nōn* e. g. O. H. G. *spornōn* 'spernere' are cited for *Nā*. They attest as well *Nō*, and variants like *sih warnōn/sih warnēn* (cf. Streitberg, Urgerm. Gram. § 208. 2.) might be explained as directly attesting proethnic *NĒ/NŌ*. Perhaps also the *nē* of Lith. *grabinėju* 'hin und her greift' (cf. Skr. *gr̥bhñāmi*) attests *NĒ* (cf. also *-mi-nēre*, no. 12, below). But as the weak stem in *Nə* would yield *nā* everywhere in Armenian and the European languages, *nā*, if proved for these languages, might be in secondary mutation with *nā*. As to the Sanskrit weak stem *nī*, I hold that it indubitably attests a long diphthong.⁴

¹ For the contrasting ideas cf. Skr. *chāyā* 'shine > < shadow', probably from the root SKHĒ(Y) 'to cut'. Note Eng. *sheer*, defined by (1) 'bright' (2) 'precipitous' (= ἀποτομος), but I believe (2) to be a throw-back to the more original meaning, cf. *lēvis* (1) 'cut smooth, rubbed', (2) 'bright, polished' (see below, no. 2).

² The Homeric phrase *νύξ δμήτεια θεῶν—καὶ ἀνδρῶν*, allows us to define "night" as 'the binder' (*δμήτεια*: *δαμάζει* 'bändigt, jungit'), cf. Shakespeare, cited above, A. γ, on sleep.

³ Does Doric *νίκημι* = *νικάω* attest **δάμνημι* = *δαμνώω* (cf. *δαμάω*)?—Naturally I cannot appeal to the explanation of *πίτνημι* as *πιτ < v > η-* (*η* = *ē*, cf. *patē-re*), as given by Reichelt, B. B. 27, 74.

⁴ Cf. Keller's discussion of this point, l. c. §§ 26–27; Umbr. *persnīmu* is indecisive, see o., above.

To reveal the state of things I imagine, and cannot prove: the paradigm of the class of verbs under discussion ran, I assume, as follows :

Sing., Act.	Sing., Mid.
-NŌ(W)MI ¹	—
-NĒ(Y)SI	-Nə(Y)SAI
-NĒ(Y)TI	-Nə(Y)TAI.

But if this state of things is not directly attested by preserved forms, it has at least one general reason in its favor: how did the type *mṛnāti* grow up alongside of *mṛnāti*? This is easily answered if there was a 1st pers. sg. MRNŌ(MI), and a 3d plur. MRNŌNTI (?-NĒNTI) common to both types,—cf. Lat. *cernunt*, κρίνουσι, Skr. *mṛnānti*: *mṛnāti* / *mṛnāti*.²

r.

For the inflexion of the Sanskrit verbs in-*nōmi* (Gr. -νῦμι and -ννῦμι³), I assume the following paradigms:

(1) strong	(2) weak	(3) weakest
-NŌ'W-MI	└ NəW-MI	
-NĒ'W-SI	└ NəW-SI	NU-SAI
-NĒ'W-TI	└ NəW-TI ⁴	NU-TAI

I cheerfully admit that no material exists to prove *ō/ē* mutation for -NŌ(W)-MI -NĒ(W)-TI.

¹ There is no material directly to prove *ō/ē* mutation, as the Greek forms -νῦμι -νῆσι -νᾶται have been brought into conformity with ἵστημι, ἵστησι, ἵσταται, τίθημι, etc. But some force may be attached to the O. H. G. evidence in *warnōn* / *warnēn*.

² It is interesting to observe how closely the paradigm of the Greek verb κρίνω, taken as a type of the -νω / -νε verbs, conforms to the assumed paradigm:

Primary	Secondary
-νω = -NŌ(W)[MI]	—
-νεῖς = -NĒ(Y)SI	-NĒYS(I)
-νει = -NĒ(Y)TI	-NĒYT(I).

I take it that -νεῖς and -νει may have originated from the secondary endings, as in Latin those endings have intruded into the present tense. Beside -νει, note the Gothic form *maur-naip*, O. H. G. *mor-nēt* (: Skr. -*nāṭ(i)*). It needs but a passing mention, how this explanation of -νεῖς -νει, helps us to solve the difficulty of the -εῖς and -ει of φέρεις φέρει and the normal ω-verbs. [But now see Brugmann, I. F. 17, 177 sq.].

³ Is -ννῦμι from SNŌUMI/NŌUMI, or is -νν in all the Greek verbs analogical from the -νν- of ζώννυμι (= *ζωσ-ννυμι),—ἐννῦμι from *ἐσ-ννυμι, being itself secondary? See above, o., fn.

⁴ Cf. Reichelt in B. B. 27, 74, *pace* Keller, l. c., § 34.

The treatment of *n* as an infix, as by Hirt, for example, (Gr. Gram. § 431), who writes a primitive **stŋ-n-éu-mi* 'I strew', Skr. *stŋnómi*, Gr. *στόρνυμι*, may be supposed to have attest in pairs like *ḡpn̄umi*: *ḡpóōw*. It is equally possible—so indeterminable is the relative chronology of the formations—to reverse the terms and derive the dissyllabic bases like *ḡpóōw* from the nasal flexion type. Take for illustration Skr. *káratī* 'makes', tolerably common in R. V, but less common than *kŋŋóti* *kŋŋulé*. We find two (or three) times in the R. V. the type *karóti*, *kurulé* which subsequently became common. The old explanation is, to my mind, correct, viz.: that the dissyllabic basis *karó-* /*kuru-* is the result of the interplay of *kára-* on *kŋŋó-* /*kŋŋu-*. Somewhat more complicated is *ḡpn̄u-* (Skr. *ŋn̄ó-*) in its relations to *ḡpou-*. We might set up two stems (1) *ŔNŌW-* /*ŔNĀW-*, (2) *ORĒ-*, blended of which would come (3) *ORŌW-* (= Gr. *ḡpou-*), and (4) *ORNĀW* (= Gr. *ḡpn̄u-*). Such blended forms were probably proethnic, at least in embryo.

S.

The following generalisation about the mechanical processes of the neolithic man. With his teeth he could tear, bite, eat; he could clamp, pinch and hold. With his nails he could cut, pinch, nip; strike with his fist; stroke, smooth and rub with his open hand; count with his fingers; shake hands, symbolic of bargaining, and so make compacts, as it were, with his hands. He could strike the earth with his feet, and thus stamp and wear hard the ground. His sexual relations also furnished a source for describing by metaphor later mechanical operations.¹ With his edged tools of flint, bone and the like, he could cut, fell and split, dig and rudely engrave; he could pierce and perforate; scrape, smooth and clean. With other stone tools he could beat², bruise, pound. With his awl and needle he could pierce holes, subsequently to be threaded with sinews. With sinews and strips of rawhide, got by a cutting process, he could lash and bind, and with a lash could cut and whip. With sharpened sticks, tipped with flint or bone, he could thrust, strike, throw at and capture game. With pointed stakes he could build enclosures, or prop walls. His dwelling was sometimes a cover of skins supported in the centre by a stake. All

¹ I have not in what follows enlarged upon sexual metaphors, but a multitude of mechanical processes similar to sex processes will occur to any reader.

² Beating, striking, thrusting are all one with cutting, as *κόπτει* and Lat. *caedit* clearly prove.

his mechanical processes had, in a widely general sense, two ends in view, 1st to alter, by some process of cutting, natural objects, and 2nd to bind together two or more natural or wrought articles. In brief he could split and he could splice, and the man who could do these things best was the knowing man, the cunning man, the able man, the scholar of the community.

t.

It is with the metaphors appropriate to such a neolithic man that I propose to deal in the following semantic study. Such metaphors constantly repeat themselves, as a study of words like the following in appropriate lexica will show, e. g. English *beat, break, cut, prick, strike*; German *schlagen, stechen, sticken, stossen, streichen*. Particularly instructive for its wide technical development is the German noun *schlag* as treated in Heyne's *Deutsches Woerterbuch*. The wide range of meaning attained by these technical words seems to me to furnish the proper point of view from which to study the vocabulary of the neolithic man.

u.

This brings me to anticipate an objection that may be raised to the attempt to reduce a great number of the words studied to one or both of the meanings to split or to splice. To say that words developed as a vocal accompaniment to trades, and that all primitive trades consisted of splitting or splicing would be to beg the question. But that the neolithic man of our linguistic stock used, sooner or later, a good many synonymous words to express rather definite concepts may be gathered from the lists given by Schrader, *Reallexikon*, s. vv. *spinnen* and *weben*. Noreen's list of words with *i/u* mutation (see d. above) furnishes a curious objective test of the frequency of the sense 'to split' in the $\check{a}(y)$ -/ $\check{a}(w)$ - roots: of his twenty lemmata nine expressly and several more indirectly mean 'to cut'.

v. (On the guttural shifts). *See after no. 64.*

w. [On the type TER-NEGĤ- (see c.): TR-GĤ-]. *See chapter III.*